



Summary of Further Submissions

Proposed District Plan Change 75

Centres Heritage Areas

Further submissions closed 27 September 2010

Absolutely

POSITIVELY

ME HEKE KI PŌNEKE
WELLINGTON CITY COUNCIL

Wellington

Proposed District Plan Change 75 Centres Heritage Areas.

Summary of Further Submissions

Further Sub No.	Sub No. support (S)/ Oppose(O)	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
FS1	35 (O)	Roland Sapsford	23 Epuni Street, Aro Valley, Wellington	Yes

The further submission relates to the proposed Aro Valley Shopping Centre Heritage Area.

The further submitter **opposes** the submission of the Architecture Centre that the plan change be revisited and that 93a and 97 Aro Street be removed from the Aro Valley Shopping Centre Heritage Area.

The plan change represents an important step towards protecting the heritage and associated character and streetscape of a number of areas around Wellington. Attempting to separate these artificially puts all such values at risk. It is essential that all the buildings in a heritage area are covered by the heritage area provisions; to do otherwise is to negate the concept of a heritage area.

No design controls exist in the Aro Valley Centre. It is essential that all buildings within the Centre are covered by heritage area provisions. Heritage area provisions enable appropriate management of potential adverse effects.

Decision Requested:

That Council reject these proposals from the Architecture Centre.

Further Sub No.	Sub No. support/op pose	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
FS2	4, 9, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 36 (O) & 5 (S)	Keith Clement and others	114 Aro Street, Aro Valley, Wellington	Yes

The further submission relates to the proposed Aro Valley Shopping Centre Heritage Area.

The further submitter **opposes** all those submissions in support of the Aro Valley Shopping Centre Heritage Area and supports those in opposition. Reasons given include:

- The policy implications of DPC75 are not fully projected
- DPC75 fails to differentiate between heritage and character
- DPC75 fails to achieve a balance between aesthetic desirability and commercial imperatives (public good vs. private cost to property holders)
- DPC75 'freezes' the area without allowing ongoing change
- 7 of the 16 buildings within the area have been substantially revised/rebuilt in the last 25 years. For have abandoned retailing. One building has never been used for retail purposes.
- Council is a poor guardian of character, instead promoting second rate mock and pretend aesthetics.

Decision Requested:

Council withdraws the Proposed Plan Change 75.

FS3	4, 9, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 36 (O) & 5, 35 (S)	Tutaenui Co Limited	97 Aro Street, Aro Valley, Wellington	Yes
-----	--	---------------------	---------------------------------------	-----

Further Sub No.	Sub No. support (S)/ Oppose(O)	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
-----------------	--------------------------------	------	---------------------	--------------------

The further submission relates to the proposed Aro Valley Shopping Centre Heritage Area. The company is the owner of 83 and 97 Aro Street.

The further submitter **opposes** all those submissions in support of the Aro Valley Shopping Centre Heritage Area and supports those in opposition. Reasons given include:

- 83 and 97 Aro Street have been extensively modernised and do not warrant heritage status
- DPC75 is anti-change, anti-business and anti-progress and adds more red tape which will contribute to the decline of Aro Valley
- Impact on private property rights and increased cost of insurance
- Increased compliance costs
- DCP75 will prejudice redevelopment of land. It should be up to owners to preserve their property if they wish
- Council should compensate building owners
- There are few supporters of DPC75 who actually own land
- The proposed heritage areas represent marginal retailing locations
- The non-contributing building owners are at an unfair advantage and DPC75 does not treat all rate payers equally. If all building owners had responded unsympathetically (like Patels superette) they would also be excluded
- The inclusion of additional Aro Valley land as Centres is nonsense. The land contains no heritage and will lead to Council demanding more mock and pretend architecture.

Decision Requested:

That Council withdraws the Proposed Plan Change 75 in respect of Aro Valley.

FS4	4, 9, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 36 (O) & 5, 35 (S)	Andrew Forbes Grant	97 Aro Street, Aro Valley, Wellington	Yes
-----	--	---------------------	---------------------------------------	-----

The further submission relates to the proposed Aro Valley Shopping Centre Heritage Area. The submitter owns 104 Aro Street.

The further submitter **opposes** all those submissions in support of the Aro Valley Shopping Centre Heritage Area and supports those in opposition. Reasons given include:

- The building does not warrant heritage status
- DPC75 is anti-change, anti-business and anti-progress and adds more red tape which will contribute to the decline of Aro Valley
- Impact on private property rights and increased cost of insurance
- Increased compliance costs
- DCP75 will prejudice redevelopment of land. It should be up to owners to preserve their property if they wish
- Council should compensate building owners
- There are few supporters of DPC75 who actually own land
- The proposed heritage areas represent marginal retailing locations
- The non-contributing building owners are at an unfair advantage and DPC75 does not treat all rate payers equally. If all building owners had responded unsympathetically they would also be excluded
- The inclusion of additional Aro Valley land as Centres is nonsense. The land contains no heritage and will lead to Council demanding more mock and pretend architecture.

Decision Requested:

That Council withdraws the Proposed Plan Change 75 in respect of Aro Valley.

FS5	4, 9, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 36 (O) & 5, 35 (S)	Christina Claire Mitchell	40 Mt Pleasant Road, Mitchelltown, Wellington, 6012	Yes
-----	--	---------------------------	---	-----

The further submission relates to the proposed Aro Valley Shopping Centre Heritage Area.

Further Sub No.	Sub No. support (S)/ Oppose(O)	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
-----------------	--------------------------------	------	---------------------	--------------------

The further submitter **opposes** all those submissions in support of the Aro Valley Shopping Centre Heritage Area and supports those in opposition. Reasons given include:

- Council and those submitters in favour have not considered the long-term effects of the heritage area
- Building owners in the heritage area will be forced into a style straight jacket
- Building owners are forced to upgrade which is costly and forces rents up leading to a change in retail mix
- The heritage area eventually becomes an enforced environment, dictated by style restraints and devoid of character or life.

Decision Requested:

That the proposed District Plan Change 75 be withdrawn.

FS6	1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 23, 26, 27, 29, 30, 33, 34, 37, 38 (O) & 32 (S)	New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)	Central Region Office, Level 1, Tadix House, 1 Blair Street, Wellington	Yes
-----	---	---	---	-----

The further submission relates to various original submitters across the majority of the proposed heritage areas (excludes Aro Valley). As a general comment, the further submitter seeks that Council adopt further financial incentives to assist building owners in heritage areas (i.e. rates relief and waving of resource consent fees).

The further submitter's specific comments on the original submissions are grouped by proposed heritage area as follows:

Berhampore

- The further submitter **opposes** submitter 34 (Simon Williams & Blair Rutherford) who seek the removal of 209 and 211 Rintoul Street from the proposed Berhampore (Rintoul Street) Shopping Centre Heritage Area. NZHPT have no reason to doubt the quality of the research undertaken. NZHPT disagree that the provision of a heritage area will lead to a lowering of property prices. NZHPT is supportive of incentives that will assist owners in maintaining their buildings and balancing the cost of regulation. Future development needs to be sensitive to its surroundings. NZHPT seeks that 209 and 211 are included in the Berhampore (Rintoul Street) Shopping Centre Heritage Area.

Hataitai

- The further submitter **opposes** submitter 3 (Jeremy Smith) who opposes the proposed Hataitai Shopping Centre Heritage Area. NZHPT believes the area has heritage value and is a good collection of small commercial buildings. Future development needs to be sensitive to its surroundings. NZHPT seeks that Hataitai Shopping Centre Heritage Area is retained as part of DPC75.
- The further submitter **opposes** submitter 11 (Telecom New Zealand) who seeks the removal of 32-34 Waitoa Road from the proposed Hataitai Shopping Centre Heritage Area. NZHPT believes the building maintains value and is in an important example of New Zealand industrial heritage. Its modernist design is an example that adds to the chronology of the area. The building occupies a prominent corner in Hataitai and its removal could affect the streetscape of the area. Future development needs to be sensitive to its surroundings. NZHPT seeks that 32-34 Waitoa Road is included in the proposed area.
- The further submitter **opposes** submitter 37 (Estate Nelson Young) who seeks the removal of 24 Waitoa Road from the Hataitai Shopping Centre Heritage Area. NZHPT believes the building maintains heritage value and is in an important central location. Its removal could affect the streetscape of the area. Future development needs to be sensitive to its surroundings. NZHPT seeks that 24 Waitoa Road is included in the proposed area.

John Street Intersection (Newtown)

- The further submitter **opposes** submitter 6 (Peter Frater) who requests that the buildings on the

Further Sub No.	Sub No. support (S)/ Oppose(O)	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<p>eastern side of Adelaide Road are not included in the proposed John Street Intersection (Newtown) Shopping Centre Heritage Area. NZHPT note, that according to the heritage assessment, this group of buildings holds heritage significance. A designation alone should not be reason that Council should restrict its ability to apply relevant regulation through the district plan. Any future development in the area will need to consider the effect on the heritage values of the area. The plan change will not remove an owner's right to develop their buildings. Provision of heritage incentive funds help with owner maintenance and compliance. NZHPT seeks that the buildings located on the eastern side of Adelaide Road are included in the proposed John Street Intersection (Newtown) Shopping Centre Heritage Area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The further submitter opposes submitter 9 (Peter Cox) who seeks the removal of 161, 163, 169 and 171 Adelaide Road from the John Street Intersection (Newtown) Shopping Centre Heritage Area. NZHPT believes the buildings maintain original heritage. 163 is a rare 19th century industrial building. 169 and 171 are some of the last surviving collages in the vicinity. Any future development in the area will need to consider the effect on the heritage values of the area. The plan change will not remove an owner's right to develop their buildings. Provision of the built heritage incentive fund can help with owner maintenance and compliance. NZHPT seeks that 161, 163, 169 and 171 Adelaide Road are as part of the proposed John Street Intersection (Newtown) Shopping Centre Heritage Area. • The further submitter opposes submitter 13 (Michael Brett Mainey) who opposes the creation of a heritage area at John Street Intersection (Newtown) and contests that 187 Adelaide Road does not have heritage value. NZHPT believes the building maintains heritage value and is harmonious in relationship and style with its surroundings. The building faces structural issues which will need to be carefully considered in the wider context – the provision of a heritage area will serve to inform decision makers. NZHPT seeks that the John Street Intersection (Newtown) Shopping Centre Heritage Area is accepted and that 187 Adelaide Road is included as part of the proposed John Street Intersection (Newtown) Shopping Centre Heritage Area. • The further submitter opposes submitter 23 (John Owen Kelman) who opposes the creation of a heritage area at the John Street Intersection (Newtown). NZHPT believes the area maintains heritage value. NZHPT does not believe that the owner's right to develop their buildings will be removed, but does acknowledge that DPC75 will add a layer of regulation. When assessing resource consents, a balance must be struck between private property rights and public interest. The built heritage incentive fund is available to assist building owners. New buildings must be designed to fit into their surroundings. NZHPT seeks that the proposed John Street Intersection (Newtown) Shopping Centre Heritage Area is accepted. • The further submitter opposes submitter 29 & 30 (Naran and Permi Bhana & Urmila Bhana) who oppose the creation of a heritage area at the John Street Intersection (Newtown) and specifically seek the removal of 7 Riddiford Street. Despite past modifications, NZHPT believes the building maintains original heritage fabric, especially the front of the building. Any future changes to the ground floor need to better integrate to the surrounding area. NZHPT seeks that 7 Riddiford Street be retained as part of the proposed John Street Intersection (Newtown) Shopping Centre Heritage Area. • The further submitter opposes submitter 33 (Howard Anthony Eastment) who seeks the removal of 19, 21 and 23 Riddiford Street from the John Street Intersection (Newtown) Shopping Centre Heritage Area. NZHPT disagree that the heritage area will lead to a lowering of property prices. NZHPT is supportive of incentives that will assist owners in maintaining their buildings and balancing the cost of regulation. NZHPT seeks that 19, 21 and 23 Riddiford Street are included as part of the proposed John Street Intersection (Newtown) Shopping Centre Heritage Area. • The further submitter opposes submitter 38 (Brain Main) who opposes the creation of a heritage area at the John Street Intersection (Newtown). The area retains heritage value and NZHPT does not agree that owners should be able to do as they wish to their property when balanced against public good. The correct balance has been struck in DCP75 but greater financial incentives should be provided. NZHPT is supportive of Council defining elements of streetscape to be retained but does not support less regulation concerning the proposed John Street Intersection (Newtown) Shopping Centre Heritage Area. 				

Further Sub No.	Sub No. support (S)/ Oppose(O)	Name	Address for Service	Wishes to be heard
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The further submitter opposes submitter 26 (Emanate Holdings) who seek the removal of 150 Riddiford Street from the Newtown Shopping Centre Heritage Area. NZHPT believes the building, whilst not eye-catching, fits well in the area and could be easily returned to a more original state. New buildings must be designed to fit into their surroundings. NZHPT seeks that 150 Riddiford Street is included as part of the proposed Newtown Shopping Centre Heritage Area. The further submitter opposes submitter 27 (Trustees Virginia Trust) who seek the removal of 138-140 Riddiford Street from the Newtown Shopping Centre Heritage Area. NZHPT believes the building maintains heritage value and is one of the more striking in the area. New buildings must be designed to fit into their surroundings. NZHPT seeks that 138 – 140 Riddiford Street is included as part of the proposed Newtown Shopping Centre Heritage Area. 				
<p><u>Thorndon</u></p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The further submitter opposes submitter 1 (Gin Young) who seeks the removal of 318 Tinakori Road from the proposed Thorndon Shopping Centre Heritage Area. NZHPT state that the building was built in 2007, but consider that it is well designed to fit into the area. Its removal could affect the streetscape of the area. NZHPT seeks that 318 Tinakori Road is included as part of the proposed area. The further submitter opposes submitter 2 (Perry Lark) who seeks the removal 273 Tinakori Road from the proposed Thorndon Shopping Centre Heritage Area. NZHPT believes the building maintains original heritage fabric and is in an important central location. Its removal could affect the streetscape of the area. NZHPT seeks that 273 Tinakori Road is included as part of the proposed area. The further submitter opposes submitter 8 (Mandy Joseph) who seeks the removal of 277-279 Tinakori Road from the Thorndon Shopping Centre Heritage Area. NZHPT believes the building maintains original heritage fabric and is in an important central location. Its removal could affect the streetscape of the area. NZHPT seeks that 277-279 Tinakori Road is included as part of the proposed area. The further submitter supports submitter 32 (Murray Pillar) who requests that Thorndon Shopping Centre Heritage Area sit within a protocol where Council consider the design of wider effects such as traffic signs, landscaping etc). NZHPT seeks that Council consider regulatory ways of improving and maintaining the streetscape. 				
<p>Decision Requested: As outlined above.</p>				